



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1093/screen/hjy023](https://doi.org/10.1093/screen/hjy023)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Vidal, B. I. (2018). Cinephilic retreats and transient connections in Hispanic cinemas. *Screen*, 59(2), 266–275.
[5]. <https://doi.org/10.1093/screen/hjy023>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Cinephilic retreats and transient connections in Hispanic cinemas

Belén Vidal

In what follows I explore the ways in which cinephilia, an area of discussion that has flourished again with the digital turn,¹ works as an idiom that is self-conscientiously performed by a mobile Hispanic cinema seeking to position itself in the relational networks of ‘World Cinema’ (a label that, like ‘Hispanic’, has undergone much scrutiny and deconstruction). Such networks – comprising private and public funders, film festivals, boutique distributors, and specialist venues – draw cultural capital from showcasing the new ‘found objects’ of cinephilia. In 2014, one such object was the Mexican fiction film *Güeros*, by first-time director Alonso Ruizpalacios. Produced with support from the Mexican Film Institute, Ruizpalacios’s debut feature had a highly successful festival run, showing at over twenty festivals between its debut at the Berlin Film Festival in February 2014 (where it took the award to Best First Feature) up to its ample recognition at the Mexican Film Awards in May 2015.² I encountered the film in a packed screening at the San Sebastián International Film Festival, where it received the Latin Horizons Prize to the best Latin American film, and the audience-voted Youth Award. And yet, *Güeros*’s success with festival audiences cannot be (and should, in fact, not be) disentangled from its uneasy relationship with cinephilia.

Two male friends, Federico (nicknamed Sombra) and Santos embark, alongside Sombra’s younger brother Tomás, on a car trip across Mexico DF in search of a legendary Mexican singer. After picking up Ana, a student activist and Sombra’s enduring old flame, at University City (the film is set against the backdrop of the 1999 student protests at the UNAM) the foursome head downtown and gatecrash a party following the screening of a new art film. The roaming camera captures scraps of conversations amidst the hipster crowd on the open-air grounds of the luxury villa, including a fleeting comment about the need for a

cinema that engages with the ‘unseen Mexico’. Feeling out of place, Santos, Tomás and Sombra sit down on a flight of lit-up steps, their faces barely visible in the evening dusk. Sombra interjects: ‘Fucking Mexican cinema. They grab a bunch of beggars, shot a film in black and white and say they are making art films’. In a quick-fire monologue, Sombra continues disparaging local directors content to play to French critics’ expectations by presenting Mexico as a nest of ‘pigs, diabetics, sell-outs, thieves, frauds, traitors, drunks, whoremongers, people with inferiority complexes and the precocious’.³ ‘That’s what it is’ replies Santos, unperturbed. Sombra retorts: ‘sure, but since we’re bound to get humiliated let them do it with their dough, not with the taxpayer’s money’. The frontal staging and rhythmic delivery by actor Tenoch Huerta stress the self-reflexive performativity of the moment. The film that prompts this discussion, while never shown nor explicitly cited, could well be the film we are watching.

Güeros’s witty complaint turns around what is, in fact, a long-standing discontent voiced by Latin Americanists: the production of exoticised images cut to the desire of transnational financing and global festival audiences.⁴ In doing so, it purposefully distances itself from popular Mexican cinema in favour of an ironic alignment with international art-cinema aesthetics.⁵ The 1:33 framing, deadpan dialogue and characterisation of Sombra and Santos as aimless slacker heroes are a throwback to the early cinema of Jim Jarmusch; the monochrome cinematography dislodges the film from its own time, enhancing the pastiche of styles reminiscent of the European New Waves. *Güeros* is nevertheless shot on digital and precise about location. Conceived as a road movie across Mexico DF, the characters’ movement across the city is punctuated by card/intertitles (such as ‘East’, ‘Centre’) that map the characters’ urban drifting as a border-crossing adventure. The cartographic organisation of the narrative is inflected by cine-literate social observation. In the car, Sombra and Ana gamely re-enact dialogue from *Los Olvidados* (Luis Buñuel, 1950) poking fun at heavy,

class-coded accents and gestuality. *Güeros*'s mapping of Mexico DF through the dreamed spaces of art cinema admits to its being a cinephilic projection, but one that opens up a space for the performance of class and race, foregrounded in the film's title.

Güeros is a sophisticated example of Latin American cinema's ability to turn cinephilic self-objectification into a more active position: from object, to *subject* of cinephilia, engaging its audience through a desire for cinema not devoid of ambivalence. In the rest of this essay I will explore cinephilia as both a strategy and a symptom compounded by the deterritorialization effect of co-productions across Hispanic cinemas:⁶ a symptom, because it signals the increasingly uncertain location of 'Hispanic-ness' in terms of modes of production and storytelling; a strategy, in the sense that cinephilia constitutes a productive retreat in the face of such uncertainties.

The desire for cinema has been historically fraught with anxiety. Sarah Keller states that there is no cinephilia without *cinephobia*: one is irremediably tied to the other, as the consciousness of the about-to-be-forgotten cinematic past expresses itself through nostalgia. For Keller, it is the relationship between love and fear that truly defines the cinematic experience in a climate of constant (technological) change.⁷ In this context, the notion of cinephilia as retreat (into the familiar and the safe) plays nowhere more openly than in films whose characters engage in cinephilic behaviour or activity. In *El crítico/The Film Critic* (Hernán Guerschuny, Argentina/Chile 2013), Víctor Téllez, is a film reviewer for a Buenos Aires newspaper, deeply nostalgic for the golden age of European art cinema and with little patience for popular films, especially the Anglo-American romantic comedies that his teenage niece Agatha teases him about. Víctor's desperate need for a new flat leads him into the path of the attractive, non-local heroine, an encounter that will force him to reconsider his ill-kempt lifestyle and his cinematic tastes. In *Sexo fácil, películas tristes/Easy Sex, Sad Movies* (Alejo Flah, Spain/Argentina, 2014), also set in a Buenos Aires devoid of tourist

landmarks, Pablo, a novelist suffering from writer's block whose marriage is foundering, takes on a commission to write the script for a romcom set in Madrid. Both narrative strands alternate and start to cross over as Pablo's sentimental life takes a turn. Finally, in *La vida útil/A Useful Life* (Federico Veiroj, Uruguay/Spain, 2010), Jorge is fully devoted to his work at the *Cinemateca Uruguaya* (the Uruguayan Film Archives); when the institution is forced to close due to its precarious finances, life as he knew it starts to change.

Despite notable differences in pace and tone (*The Film Critic* takes a leaf out of Woody Allen's neurotic comedy book, *Easy Sex, Sad Movies* has a mimetic relationship with the Hollywood romcom, and *A Useful Life* is closer to the austere aesthetics of slow cinema) all three films read the dominating presence of cinema in the lives of their white, middle-class protagonists through the comedy of male anxiety. Each of these scenarios is resolved through the possibility of the hero stepping out of his retreat, and into heterosexual romance. The retreats offered by cinephilia, while embedded in the banality of the everyday are a response to the difficult navigation of inter-personal relationships, but also of urban spaces, which become imbued with meta-cinematic references.

The connection between cinephilia and Hispanic cinemas requires some elaboration. Malte Hagener has argued that cinephilia is a mode of intersubjectivity doubly predicated on the affirmation of self, and the presentation of that self to others: a mode that, despite its insular solipsism *a priori* has proved, historically, a basis for communication, its shared practices providing the gel for disparate communities radicated in a common love for cinema.⁸ Community, the key to cinephilia's historical legibility, also echoes the formation of a transnational Hispanic space. Writing in 2008, Marvin D'Lugo called transnational Hispanic co-productions 'a way of transforming movie audiences into a virtual community of shared ethical and cultural values'.⁹ Such aspiration became politically operative in a milestone such as *Fresa y chocolate/Strawberry and Chocolate* (Tomás Gutiérrez Alea and

Juan Carlos Tabío, Cuba/Mexico/Spain, 1993), a culturally Cuban co-production whose strong gay rights message appealed to a metaphorical ‘Hispanic Atlantic’, and beyond.¹⁰ And yet, as explored by Cerdán and Fernández Labayen in this dossier, this exercise in re-mapping reveals asymmetric relationships of knowledge and power, which the often tortuous financing of independent cinemas has only exacerbated. Cinephilic cinema has started to address this unbalance creatively, sometimes in literal ways. The metacinematic *El escarabajo de oro/The Gold Bug* (Alejo Muguillansky, and Fia-Stina Sandlund, Sweden/Denmark/Argentina, 2014) satirises the financially driven alliance between culturally disparate agents and agendas on which the transnational networks of art cinema are often founded (in this case, the partnership between the independent Argentine outfit El Pampero Cine and the Copenhagen International Documentary Festival, CPH: DOX that enables the film). The Argentinian crew hijacks its production arrangements into the making of an anti-colonial fiction; the resulting road movie is both a comic paean to filibusterous practices from below and a proud example of peripheral, minor cinema. Going back to *Güeros*, Sombra’s rant against a *certain* idea of Mexican cinema is coloured with what Keller identifies as the first of various historical manifestations of cinephobia: the anxiety about being captured on film, with the attendant perils of surveillance and misrecognition.¹¹ The misrecognition of the self as the transient love object in the eyes of the European other is, however, turned around in different ways in the films under examination.

The symptomatic response to this problematic relocation of identity is a sense of dislocation. In these meta-films, the cinephilic retreat creates disorienting spaces. *The Film Critic* opens with a stylised montage of black and white photographs of Víctor captured against the backdrop of Parisian landmarks, including its cinemas. Victor’s French voiceover bitterly complains about feeling asphyxiated by cinema itself; he professes to suffer cinema as an illness (‘la maladie du cinéma’). In the next sequence, a series of handheld, over-the-

shoulder shots in colour follow Victor across an anonymous urban environment into a basement screening room. The voiceover in French is still amplifying his thoughts but, upon arrival he is greeted by a PR speaking in Argentinian Spanish. This comic mismatch introduces a disjunction between the character's clichéd self-presentation as a Eurocentric cinephile – albeit one plagued by anxiety – and the monotony of a life spent in cramped screening rooms and nondescript cafés. When Víctor's search for a place to live prompts the meet-cute with comedy heroine Sofía at the only available desirable property, the city starts to turn into a set ripe with markers of the kinds of films he despises: digital rear projection ostensibly adds fireworks to the backdrop of Víctor and Sofia's first kiss; when he rushes to the airport to stop her from leaving, he is caught in the pouring rain, but this downpour is a mere special effect – Víctor has just walked into a shoot, ruining a take featuring Argentinian star Leonardo Sbaraglia (playing himself). As the Godard-loving critic laments, he is trapped in a genre in which he does not belong.

In *The Film Critic*, the emotional confusion experienced by the central character is tantamount to his progressively losing his moorings. While reassuringly reflexive in its visual and narrative nods to the romcom genre, *The Film Critic's* retreat into an out-of-synch Eurocentric cinephilia runs parallel to the mutation of urban locality into ersatz location. This mutation is also a feature of *Easy Sex, Sad Movies*, a film that interweaves even more tightly and explicitly its own production history with the sense of dislocation experienced by the protagonist. Pablo is cajoled by a producer friend to write a script that may easily attract co-production funds. The story laboriously composed by the depressed author is dramatized as the visual and narrative opposite to his own (the framing storyline). The nested storyline is set on generic locations (a bookshop, a park, pedestrian thoroughfares, cosy bars and apartments) in a picture-perfect yet unmarked Madrid. The Spanish city is re-imagined as a cinematic

construction where an attractive young couple plays out the textbook romcom motifs (boy finds girl, loses her and then recovers her) to clockwork perfection.

Like *The Film Critic*, *Easy Sex*, *Sad Movies* is a co-production enabled through the Iberoamerican partnership fund Ibermedia, in this case with Spain as majority partner.¹² The participation of Argentinian producer Patagonik Film Group, partially owned by Buena Vista International meant that the distribution of this film in Argentina (under the more family-friendly title *Love and Other Stories*) was, effectively, in the hands of Disney. This loophole in funding policy allows for supranational Ibermedia funds ringfenced to subsidise independent transnational film production to make their way into the pockets of multinational corporations.¹³ For Libia Villazana, this practice results into an inevitable loss of aesthetic value that results from social decontextualisation.¹⁴ Yet the self-reflexive plot of *Easy Sex*, *Sad Movies* channels the resulting tension between the desire for products that work as agents for community-building, and the neoliberal market conditions that shape the circulation of such cultural products onto the actual narrative space of the film. In the first act of the film, the walking shot that frames the tense conversation between Pablo and his producer friend Andrés about the commissioned script comments on the film's own erasure of cultural difference as a result of generic constraints and complex production alliances ('the film's got to be light. Audiences don't want downers... make the city look like Paris or New York', Andrés insists, with reference to the Madrid setting). This conversation unfolds in a nearly two-minute backward steadicam shot, in which the deep-focus photography captures the hustle and bustle of runners, technicians and assorted crew members in the background of the shot. This long take presents the signature stylistic traits of cinematic realism (production of continuous space) but refuses to restore the links with the social world. Instead, the scene mirrors the culturally mobile character of the below-the-line labour gone into the production of the film we are watching.

Figures 1a and 1b. Industrial imperatives, and romantic fictions: the two worlds of *Easy Sex, Sad Movies* (Alejo Flah, 2014).

Editing reinforces the effect of geographic dislocation: the film constantly cross-cuts between Pablo's stagnant emotional life and the romance he is trying to write, set in an imaginary Madrid that satisfies the financing requirements of the fictional *as well as* the real co-production. The film's interlocking locations and stories means that each narrative world is permanently destabilised by the elsewhere of fiction. Although Pablo's story, like his script, ends with romance, such resolution necessitates Pablo's taking of the ferry to Montevideo to meet a new love interest, thus entering a different kind of transnational arrangement. Both love and cinephilia surrender to the unmooring of experience facilitated by transnational flows and alliances.

My final point concerns the retreat into the love of the medium itself at a time when the digital paradigm has led to another kind of relocation: the migration of the cinematic experience across a variety of new environments and formats.¹⁵ This spatial reconfiguration of the apparatus, while rendering 'film' ubiquitous through the digital medium at the point of its technical disappearance has triggered new anxieties. Chief among them is, as noted by Jason Sperb, the blurring between profilmic and the postfilmic elements in the digital workflow, bringing material consequences for labour practices,¹⁶ as well as renewing age-old fears 'about what the film is actually capturing'.¹⁷ *The Film Critic* draws substantial comic mileage from digital anxiety; in one scene Víctor is tricked by Agatha into believing that a random sample of CCTV footage is an experimental short film; his reactions range from irritation, when unable to find the exit out of an innocuous VR gaming experience reproducing a golf course, to perplexity, when confronted to a piece of rudimentary software

for writing film reviews that dispenses with the critic's rhetorical skills. Víctor is the perfect subject of, to use Sperb's phrase, analog nostalgia.¹⁸

Paraphrasing Sperb, I would argue that nostalgia for the analogic world across popular culture constitutes a retreat from 'the immaterial realities of the digital age'.¹⁹ In *Güeros*, the discourse of love pointedly addresses the medium itself, but is predicated on the authenticity of a particular sound as opposed to the mendacity of film representation deplored by Sombra: the music of (fictional) lost icon Epigmenio Cruz, hailed by Tomás as 'the singer who once made Bob Dylan cry', and by Sombra as 'the guy who could have saved Mexican rock'. Yet this sound is never heard. The film shows, in close-up, the battered cassette that Tomás carries around with him; when he places the headphones over Ana's ears and plays the tape in his Walkman (a moment that is captured in an insert), the exterior shot gets drained of all ambient sound. All that is heard is the gentle rusting sound of the old tape in the portable player. The film's clever use of silence each time the music is played on the Walkman means that this narrative motif gets deferred to the sonic imprint of the obsolete playback technology, which in turn creates a visual signifier: traces of sublimity written across the surprised, delighted, curious, or ecstatic facial close-ups of the characters, momentarily transported by something that cannot be shared with the spectator. This synesthetic displacement alludes to cinephilia's solipsistic retreat, but acquires its full significance in its ability to strengthen the bond between Santos, Sombra and Tomás, a community of passionate 'Epigmeniophiles', which will later include Ana.

Figure 2. Analog nostalgia and displaced cinephilia in *Güeros* (Alonso Ruizpalacios, 2014)

A Useful Life takes nostalgia for a quickly disappearing medium further. This last example highlight the links between medium obsolescence and the phasing out of labour practices specific to minor Hispanic film cultures out of step with full-scale digitisation. In this sixty-five minute film the medium itself, and the spaces where it is preserved, stand for a way of life lived as a quietly radical form of cinephilic retreat. Partially set in the Uruguayan Film Archives in Montevideo, *A Useful Life* basks in the physical detail of everyday material practices in the archive. Retrieving film cans from tight storage spaces, having standing lunch while overseeing a projection from the booth, checking the theatre's seating, or recording an announcement to request patrons' support to the *Cinemateca* in an old-fashioned tape recorder are some of the tasks we see Jorge (Jorge Jellinek) perform in the first part of the film, before the cinemathèque's closure unexpectedly disrupts his well-established routines. Through static framing or minimal panning within lingering shots, these scenes present the film archive through the structural slowness of modes of labour seemingly outside the accelerated regimes of the digital. Film journalist and radio presenter Jellinek and Manuel Martínez Carril, a veteran programmer and projectionist at the *Cinemateca Uruguaya* play versions of their real-life occupations, creating a faultless continuity between the actual and the represented spaces of the archive. Their performances distil serious composure not exempt of deadpan humour. The film's loving approach to the most mundane aspects of the archives makes for an eloquent paean to the economically compromised institution. *A Useful Life* directly questions not just of the usefulness of cinema, but the usefulness of cinephilia under the pressures of technological obsolescence and the fragmentation of communities of spectators who are increasingly estranged from the time-honoured rituals of cinema-going.

Figure 3. Slowness and the materiality of the film archive in *A Useful Life* (Federico Veiroj, 2010)

The melancholic tone of Veiroj's film, shot on 35 mm, and the presentation of a world in retreat from the accelerated pace of neoliberal capitalism appear cut to the measure of the world cinema festivals' desire for authentic (i.e. local) images suitable for consumption across the Hispanic Atlantic. The film was the winner of the *Cine en Construcción* prize in the San Sebastian Film Festival of 2009 while still in development; the prize granted Spanish funds for completion. *A Useful Life* went on to win Best Film at BAFICI in 2011, and Best Film at FICCI (Cartagena) in 2011, as well as entering a number of other festivals in Latin America and Europe. As noted in relation to *Güeros*, festival success stories such as this speak of the uneven power relations underlying the logic of European funding initiatives,²⁰ but also point at what David Martin-Jones and María Soledad Montañez have called 'auto-erasure' in relation to Uruguayan cinema: a form, specific to but not exclusive of Uruguayan independent or 'unknown auteur' films, of strategically neutralising the markers of nation, principally through spatial aesthetics. Auto-erasure avoids self-etnography, or reification of one's own cultural difference, directing the international spectator's attention to the detail of performances and the act of storytelling.²¹ This is not to say that *A Useful Life* is completely devoid of national markers. For example, the song 'Los caballos perdidos' ('The Lost Horses') a throwback to the political context of Uruguay in the 1980s,²² serves as commentary on the demise of the venerable institution in a key moment in the story. Music conspicuously inflects the tone of the final moments of the film too, in which an overblown orchestral score heightens the mood against the grain of the banal, quotidian actions portrayed in the visual track, investing Jorge's first steps outside his life in the archive with nearly epic significance. The music stops, and as Jorge waits for a female acquaintance on the university's premises, he breaks into a little dance on a flight of stairs, a gesture that delicately signals the classic film musical tradition. The retreat into cinephilia creates, once

more, a transient connection beyond the logic of locality, stressing its deterritorialised condition.

In this essay I have looked at instances of contemporary Hispanic films that effect a shift in perspective: from object to subject of cinephilia. Cinephilia as a theme and as a mode of address re-focuses the relationship between films and spectators within the mobile, unstable boundaries of Hispanic cinemas. Cinephilia is, however, bound with its opposite, cinephobia, a tension that surfaces in the discussed films through the conditions and effects of dislocation, the fetishism of the medium's material vestiges and, in particular, through the film's retreats into imagined worlds that are both desirable and fraught with anxiety about their own transience. The cinephilic film may be, after all, an anomaly, and aberration even in the landscape of contemporary Hispanic cinemas. Too over-connoted, too self-involved, too *in retreat* from any markers of social, political, or cultural situated-ness, these films however speak of a Hispanic world cinema more interconnected than ever, and yet superbly attuned to the short-circuits of connectivity: the glitches, the misreadings, and the dynamics of mutual projection in a yet incomplete digital modernity.²³

¹ See my 'Cinephilia Goes Global: Loving Cinema in the Post-cinematic Age', in Rob Stone, Paul Cooke, Stephanie Dennison and Alex Marlow-Mann (eds) *The Routledge Companion to World Cinema* (London and New York: Routledge: 2017), pp. 404-414.

² Although *Güeros* was the most widely honoured Mexican film of 2014 in terms of international festival awards (it received a total of fifteen), this level of recognition did not translate into strong results at the domestic box-office. Upon its release in March 2015 the film factored in a mere 55,530 admission tickets in theatres (the top Mexican films from 2014 and 2015 registered over four million spectators); at the time of its success at the Mexican Film Awards *Güeros* was described in the press as 'unknown to most Mexican audiences'.

Although this aspect falls beyond the scope of my discussion, it reflects a pattern in the reception of cinephilic films. See Statistical Yearbook of Mexican Cinema 2015 (México D.F.: Instituto Mexicano de Cinematografía, 2016) < <http://www.imcine.gob.mx/cine-mexicano/publicaciones/anuario-estadistico> > accessed 1 October 2017; Luis Pablo Beauregard, “‘Güeros’ triunfa en los premios Ariel’ (28 May 2015) < https://elpais.com/cultura/2015/05/28/actualidad/1432784885_123664.html > accessed 1 October 2017.

³ English subtitles provided by the UK DVD edition of *Güeros* (London: New Wave Films, 2016). The rest of the cited dialogue is my own translation.

⁴ For a summary of these debates, see Deborah Shaw, ‘European Co-production Funds and Latin American Cinema: Processes of Othering and Bourgeois Cinephilia in Claudia Llosa’s *La teta asustada*’, *Diogenes*, vol. 62, no. 1 (2016), pp 1-12.

⁵ *Güeros*’s aesthetic difference and cinephilic fit in the festival circuit (see note 2) is symptomatic of the insertion of post-2000 Mexican neoliberal cinema into the financial and semantic structures of global cinema, best exemplified by the auteur trajectory of Alfonso Cuarón or Carlos Reygadas. See Ignacio M. Sánchez Prado, *Screening Neoliberalism. Transforming Mexican Cinema, 1988-2012* (Vanderbilt: Nashville University Press, 2014), pp. 155-226. For an overview of Sánchez Prado’s critique in relation to *Güeros* see Jacobo Asse Dayán, ‘*Güeros*: Social Fragmentation, Political Agency, and the Mexican Film Industry under Neoliberalism’, *Norteamérica*, 12.1 (2017), pp. 137-168.

⁶ For an extended discussion of deterritorialization with specific reference to financing in Latin American cinema, see Luisela Alvaray, ‘Are we global yet? New challenges to defining Latin American cinema’, *Studies in Spanish and Latin American Cinemas*, vol. 8 no. 1 (2011), pp 69-86.

⁷ Sarah Keller, 'Cinephobia. To Wonder, To Worry', *Lola*, no. 5 (2014)

<<http://www.lolajournal.com/5/cinephobia.html>> accessed 1 January 2017.

⁸ Malte Hagener, 'Cinephilia in the Age of the Post-Cinematographic' *Photogénie*, no. 0 (2014) <http://www.photogenie.be/photogenie_blog/article/cinephilia-age-post-cinematographic> accessed 1 January 2017.

⁹ Marvin D'Lugo, 'Across the Hispanic Atlantic: cinema and its symbolic relocations', *Studies in Spanish and Latin American Cinemas*, vol. 5, no. 1 & 2 (2008), p. 4.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Keller, 'Cinephobia. To Wonder, To Worry'.

¹² For details on projects funded, see the website of Ibermedia.

<<http://www.programaibermedia.com/proyectos>> accessed 1 January 2017.

¹³ Libia Villazana, 'Hegemony Conditions in the Coproduction Cinema of Latin America: The Role of Spain', *Framework*, vol. 49, no. 2 (2008), pp. 69-70. See also Tamara L. Falicov's key study on Ibermedia, 'Ibero-Latin American Co-productions: Transnational Cinema Spain's Public Relations Venture or Both?' in Stephanie Dennison (ed) *Contemporary Hispanic Cinema. Interrogating the Transnational in Spanish and Latin American Film* (Woodbridge: Tamesis, 2013), pp. 67-88.

¹⁴ Villazana, 'Hegemony Conditions', p. 70.

¹⁵ On the medium's relocation, see Francesco Casetti, *The Lumière Galaxy: Seven Key Words for the Cinema to Come* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2015), pp. 17-42.

¹⁶ Jason Sperb, *Flickers of Film. Nostalgia in the Time of Digital Cinema* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press), p. 20-23.

¹⁷ See Keller, 'Cinephobia. To Wonder, To Worry'.

¹⁸ Jason Sperb, after D.N Rodowick, in *Flickers of Film*, p. 23.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 16.

²⁰ See Miriam Ross, 'The film festival as producer: Latin American Films and Rotterdam's Hubert Bals Fund', *Screen*, vol. 52, no 2 (2011), pp. 261-267; Nuria Triana Toribio, 'Building Latin American Cinema in Europe: Cine en Construcción/Cinéma en Construction' in *Contemporary Hispanic Cinema*, pp. 89-112.

²¹ David Martin-Jones and María Soledad Montañez, 'Uruguay Disappears: Small Cinemas, Control Z Films, and the Aesthetics and Politics of Auto-Erasure', *Cinema Journal*, vol. 53, no.1 (2013), pp. 44-45.

²² About the significance of the song see Michael Guillen's interview with Federico Veiroj, 'Cinema Is Dead/Long Live Cinema: A Conversation with Federico Veiroj', *Mubi*, 2 October 2010. <<https://mubi.com/notebook/posts/cinema-is-dead-long-live-cinema-a-conversation-with-federico-veiroj>> accessed 1 March 2017.

²³ Belén Vidal has written this article in the context of the Research Project 'Transnational relations in Spanish-American digital cinema: the cases of Spain, Mexico and Argentina' (CSO2014-52750-P) funded by the Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness of the Spanish Government and co-financed with FEDER funds.